



# Public Utility District No. 1 of Douglas County

1161 Valley Mall Parkway • East Wenatchee, Washington 98802-4497 • 509/884-7191 • FAX 509/884-0553 • www.douglaspud.org

April 24, 2007

Honorable Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington DC 20426

**Subject: Wells Hydroelectric Project No. 2149-131  
Licensee Response to Stakeholder Comments on Scoping Document 1  
and Stakeholder Comments on the Pre-Application Document**

Dear Secretary:

The Public Utility District No. 1 of Douglas County, Washington (Douglas PUD), licensee of the Wells Hydroelectric Project (Wells Project), hereby submits response comments to stakeholder comments on Scoping Document 1 (SD1) and the Pre-Application Document (PAD).

To date a total of ten stakeholder comment and/or study request letters were filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) by the April 2, 2007 deadline. Entities filing comments and/or study requests included the following: City of Pateros (2), Betty Wagoner (1), Friends of Fort Okanogan (1), Washington Department of Ecology (1), City of Brewster (1), Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (1), FERC (1), Department of Interior (DOI) – United States Fish and Wildlife Service (1) and DOI – Bureau of Indian Affairs (1). These letters included a variety of comments on SD1, the PAD and contained numerous references to proposed protection, mitigation and enhancement (PME) measures. Several of the letters received by the April 2<sup>nd</sup> deadline included informal requests for additional information but only one letter, filed by the City of Pateros, included a formal ILP study request that attempted to address FERC's seven study request criteria per 18 CFR § 5.9.

Douglas PUD has reviewed each of the letters received and has prepared the following response to stakeholder's comments on SD1 and the PAD. Douglas PUD will respond to the one (1) stakeholder study request and the various information requests in our Proposed Study Plan Document (PSP) that will be filed with FERC by the May 17, 2007 deadline.

## Douglas PUD Response to Stakeholder Comments on SD1

During our review of the ten stakeholder letters commenting on various aspects of SD1, Douglas PUD identified several statements that require a formal response. We request that FERC consider our response in preparing Scoping Document 2 (SD2).

### United States Fish and Wildlife Service

On March 30, 2007 the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) submitted comments to Douglas PUD, copying the FERC, regarding the Notice of Intent to File License Application for New License, Pre-Application Document; Commencement of Licensing Proceeding; Scoping; Soliciting Comments on the Pre-Application Document and Scoping Document; Study Requests for the Wells Hydroelectric Project.

Douglas PUD appreciates the support and active participation by the USFWS during the ongoing Resource Work Group (RWG) process. Their participation in this process has led to a well defined package of twelve proposed study plans that will be used to broaden our collective understanding of the effects of the Wells Project on natural resources.

We provide the following response to the USFWS comments related to FERC's SD1.

On page 7 of the March 30, 2007 letter, the USFWS states:

**B. 4.2.1 Aquatic Resources (page 13).** The Commission presented a preliminary list of environmental issues to be addressed that include, *“Effects of the project on water temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH and turbidity.”* The Service recommends that this environmental issue include an examination of aquatic habitat temperatures situated along the fringes of the Wells Reservoir. Accordingly, this environmental issue would be rephrased to read as follows: *“Effects of the project on water temperature (i.e., including aquatic habitats located along the fringes of the Wells Reservoir), dissolved oxygen, pH, and turbidity.”*

Douglas PUD would like to point out that the aquatic habitats on the fringes of a river are a product of natural and impounded river processes. These habitats are available not only in reservoir systems, but in the reaches of many natural, unimpounded river systems. Temperature and other water quality parameters within these aquatic habitats, in both unimpounded and impounded river reaches, are governed by similar factors making it very difficult to quantify the level of Project effect on localized temperatures.

While reservoir “fringe” temperatures may vary slightly from reservoir mean temperature, this would be expected to occur in any natural system and does not in and of itself constitute a problem, or lead to a conclusion of adverse effects to aquatic life. In fact, Douglas PUD found no such connection, and, to the contrary, found a robust and native dominated aquatic ecosystem in the reservoir.

Douglas PUD agreed, in the Aquatic RWG process, to conduct a water temperature study that will look at the macro effects of the Wells Project on water temperature. Douglas PUD is not aware of an accurate tool for collecting and modeling the project's effect on water temperatures in reservoir shoreline micro or fringe habitats.

Due to all the points raised above, Douglas PUD believes that the scope of the Environmental Assessment (EA) should not be broadened to require an additional analysis of the Project's potential effect on water temperatures in reservoir shoreline habitats. There is no evidence of a Project effect, nor is there any basis to assume a Project impact, on aquatic resources due to this issue. Douglas PUD recommends that FERC maintain the existing language, contained within SD1, and utilize this same language in SD2.

#### Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

On March 30, 2007 the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) submitted comments to FERC related to the PAD, SD1 and Study Requests for Douglas PUD's Wells Hydroelectric Project.

Douglas PUD has enjoyed a positive working relationship with WDFW for many years. This relationship includes cooperating on the Wells Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), the operation and evaluation of Douglas PUD's hatchery programs, funding WDFW to operate the six units of the Wells Wildlife Area and raising resident rainbow trout for stocking in regional lakes.

We greatly appreciate WDFW's supportive comments related to the PAD's identified issues, Issues Determination Statements and twelve proposed studies. We also greatly appreciate their active and thoughtful participation during the RWG process. Their participation in the RWGs has led to a well defined package of twelve proposed study plans that will be used to broaden the understanding of the effects of the Wells Project on natural resources.

We provide the following comments to FERC concerning WDFW's recent comments related to the scope of SD1.

On page 3 of the March 30, 2007 letter, WDFW states:

#### **B. 4.1.2 Geographic Scope.**

2. The upstream extent of the Wells Project boundary is the State Hwy. 17 Bridge crossing of the Columbia River at Bridgeport, Washington, which is also the lower end of the tailrace of Chief Joseph Dam. To the extent Wells Project operations affect tailrace conditions upstream of the Hwy. 17 Bridge, the geographic scope for aquatic resources should extend upstream into the Chief Joseph Dam tailrace.

Douglas PUD would like to point out that the existing Wells Project boundary already includes those portions of the Columbia River affected by the Wells Project. The Wells Project does not include the tailrace of Chief Joseph Dam because that portion of the Columbia River is primarily controlled and influenced by Chief Joseph Dam. We recommend that FERC retain the geographic scope as previously identified within SD1.

On page 5 of the March 30, 2007 letter, WDFW states:

**C. 4.2 Resource Issues.**

**4.2.1 Aquatic Resources**

1. *Effects of the Project, and other hydroelectric project operations in the mid-Columbia River region, on water temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, and turbidity within the Project boundary.* **WDFW Comment:** WDFW recommends the issue statement be reworded as represented by the bold font and strikeout. Project water temperature is a subject of great environmental significance and should be addressed as a primary, stand-alone issue. Evaluation of the Wells Project contribution to adverse temperature conditions in the mid-Columbia River reach should be assessed in a regional geographic scope. Additionally, the study proposed by the PUD in the PAD (section 6.3.1.6), Development of a Water Temperature Model Relating Project Operations to Compliance with the Washington State and EPA Water Quality Standards is a necessary study and should be included in the scope of the 2-year Integrated Licensing Process (ILP) study period as proposed.

Douglas PUD recognizes the environmental significance of addressing water temperature as it relates to project effects on water quality within the Wells Project. Douglas PUD has included four proposed study plans, collaboratively developed within the Aquatic RWG (Douglas PUD and stakeholders), to address water quality issues within the Wells Project.

We agree that it is important to be able to distinguish the effects of upstream hydroelectric projects (and other human induced impacts), from the effects of the Wells Project when evaluating whether numeric standards for temperature are met at the Project. However, the addition of the language “and other hydroelectric project operations in the mid-Columbia River region” implies that it is the responsibility of Douglas PUD to analyze and account for potential effects on water temperature resulting from not only the operation of the Wells Project, but also the operations of numerous other mid-Columbia River projects. The intent of the scoping process is to evaluate the potential effects of only Wells Dam. Toward this end, the scope of Douglas PUD’s proposed water temperature study was specifically designed to assess the effects of the operation of the Wells Project on water temperature. To accomplish this goal, Douglas PUD will have to establish the effect that incoming water temperatures have on the water quality of the Wells Project. However, it cannot be within the scope of Douglas PUD’s modeling to evaluate other hydro projects in the mid-Columbia region.

The results of Douglas PUD’s study will be used to evaluate its compliance with the applicable state and federal water quality standards. Information gathered from this study can certainly be utilized in other forums, with a larger geographic scope than the Wells Project; however, it is not Douglas PUD’s responsibility to evaluate the effects of other hydroelectric projects or other human activities, including those upstream or downstream of Wells Dam, on water temperatures in the Columbia River.

We recommend that FERC retain the original language found within SD1 that includes an analysis of the, “*Effects of the project on water temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH and turbidity*”. We also encourage FERC to approve the four water quality study plans, including the study plan to evaluate the effect of the Wells Project on water temperatures in the mid-Columbia River.

Page 5-6 of the March 30, 2007 letter from WDFW states:

**C. 4.2 Resource Issues.**

**4.2.1 Aquatic Resources**

2. *Effects of the Project, and other hydroelectric project operations in the mid-Columbia River region, on dissolved oxygen, pH, and turbidity within the Project boundary.* As per number 2 above, WDFW recommends this issue be added as a stand-alone issue within the scope of the Wells Project relicensing. Reservoir water dissolved oxygen content can, at least seasonally, show an inverse relationship to reservoir water temperature. It should be noted that mine and smelter effluents are discharged into the mainstem Columbia River in British Columbia.

Douglas PUD believes that WDFW’s suggested new language, “*and other hydroelectric project operations in the mid-Columbia River region,*” assigns responsibilities to Douglas PUD well beyond the scope of a traditional EA. Douglas PUD agrees with WDFW’s comment that other hydro and non-hydro projects, including smelters, Grand Coulee, Canadian Storage projects and Chief Joseph all have a significant effect on the water quality of the Wells Project, including dissolved oxygen. However, we do not believe that it is appropriate for Douglas PUD to be required to conduct an analysis that would demonstrate the additive effect of these projects on the water quality of the Wells Project. We also do not believe that it is Douglas PUD’s responsibility to conduct an analysis of the effects of downstream dams on compliance with the water quality standards. Douglas PUD recommends that FERC retain the original language found within SD1 related to the measurement of the project’s effect on water dissolved oxygen, pH and turbidity.

On page 7 of the March 30, 2007 letter, WDFW states:

**C. 4.2 Resource Issues.**

**4.2.1 Aquatic Resources**

7. *Effectiveness of the PUD's nuisance pikeminnow and avian wildlife control programs on native resident fish populations within the Project boundary controlling predation of listed salmon and steelhead juveniles and identification and evaluation of the cost and benefits of potential alternatives to the existing program.* WDFW recommends you edit the wording of this issue statement as represented by the bold font and strikeout. The issue of the effectiveness of the PUD's nuisance control program to control predation on salmon and steelhead juveniles within the Project boundary is contained in the Wells HCP. WDFW believes these predator control measures aimed at reducing native pikeminnow and avian predation effects, in concert with other HCP requirements for meeting juvenile anadromous salmonid survival standards, are sufficient to address Project mortality on juvenile salmon and steelhead. As such, WDFW does not believe cost and benefit analyses of the PUD pikeminnow and avian predation control programs are necessary.

We agree with WDFW that the Wells HCP requires an effective predator control program to reduce the take of juvenile salmonids in the reservoir, tailrace and hatcheries and we concur that there is no need to conduct a cost and benefit analysis of the PUD pikeminnow and avian predation control program. However, the true intent of the proposed nuisance wildlife control study plan, developed collaboratively in the Terrestrial RWG (including WDFW and USFWS wildlife biologists), is to evaluate whether the existing nuisance wildlife control program is targeting the correct species of wildlife (birds and mammals). The study will also evaluate alternatives to the existing technologies utilized to control nuisance wildlife.

WDFW appears to be recommending that this issue be restructured to focus on pikeminnow and not on nuisance wildlife. As discussed at the Scoping Meeting on February 28, 2007, this is not an Aquatic issue but rather a Terrestrial issue related to the nuisance wildlife control study collaboratively developed by the Terrestrial RWG. We recommend that FERC retain the original language found within SD1 and the PAD proposing an analysis of the effectiveness of the nuisance wildlife control program.

On page 14 of the March 30, 2007 letter, WDFW states:

#### **4.2.2 Terrestrial Resources**

1. *Whether the project transmission line represents an avian electrocution or collision hazard.* This Terrestrial Resource Issue should...WDFW believes a follow-up study to investigate the effect of new 230 kV transmission line corridors on sage grouse and sharp-tailed grouse are necessary following their construction...

Douglas PUD is not proposing to install a new 230 kV transmission line. The existing 230 kV transmission lines, and associated right-of-way, are adequate to deliver the power generated at the Wells Hydroelectric Project to Douglas Switchyard where the power generated at Wells is connected to the northwest transmission network.

#### **Bureau of Indian Affairs**

By letter of March 30, 2007, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) submitted comments to FERC Scoping Document 1 (SD1) for the Wells Hydroelectric Project.

The BIA letter indicates that BIA would like to work with Douglas PUD to:

“...develop a strategy for quantifying Project effects (including those ongoing project effects that began during the last license term but will continue into the future) and demonstrating that those effects will be appropriately mitigated for the term of the next license.”

Douglas PUD agrees that it will be important for the Environmental Assessment, as outlined and described in SD1, to identify ongoing and existing project impacts, consistent with FERC's licensing guidelines<sup>1</sup> and case law. The SD1 as written appears consistent with prior court findings that have clearly articulated that the environment, as it exists today, is the proper baseline condition and the baseline against which FERC should consider the effects of the Project as proposed for relicensing and any alternatives.

The issue of the proper baseline against which to consider alternative measures to protect the environment has been taken up directly by two separate U. S. Courts of Appeals. In the case of *American Rivers v. FERC*, 201 F.3d 1186, 1195-99, (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000), dealing with the Walterville and Leaburg hydro plants, the Court agreed with and upheld FERC's conclusion that “it is highly doubtful that attempts to ascertain the status of various resources prior to the time a 50-year old project was constructed would result in the development of any useful information”. The Court went on to say “We believe that (FERC's) conclusion furnishes a reasonable interpretation of the FPA. It defies common sense and notions of pragmatism to require the Commission or license applicants to gather information to recreate a 50-year-old environmental base upon which to make present day development decisions.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Preparing Environmental Assessments, Guidelines for Applicants, Contractors and Staff, FERC, March 2001; Handbook for Hydroelectric Project Licensing and 5 MW Exemptions from Licensing. FERC, April 2004.

Similarly, in the case of Conservation Law Foundation v. FERC, 216 F.2d 41, 46 (D.C. Cir. 2000), wherein the main argument of the petitioners was that FERC should not have treated existing conditions as the baseline option because this caused “the Commission to ignore ongoing impacts directly attributable to the new license,” the Court found that for FERC to properly perform its environmental obligations under the FPA, the “Commission must compare what might occur to fish and wildlife if the license does not include protection for nonpower resources against what will occur with conditions imposed.” The Court agreed with FERC’s approach of using existing conditions as the baseline, stating further that “it hardly follows that the Commission must imagine the (project area) as it existed before 1899 and assess the effect of relicensing by pretending that the (project dam) does not exist -- at least when no one advocates decommissioning the (project) and tearing down the dam.”

Therefore, Douglas PUD’s approach to assessing project effects has been directed specifically at describing the existing (baseline) project-related environment and assessing the beneficial and adverse effects that the Wells Project and its continued operation would have on environmental resources. Thus far, the baseline (existing) relicensing studies conducted by Douglas PUD and the studies collaboratively developed and proposed in the PAD by the RWGs, for completion during the ILP study period, have specifically avoided conducting or proposing studies directed at characterizing resources that existed prior to the original licensing and construction of the project.

On page 3 of BIA’s March 30, 2007 letter, it states:

9. Page 16, Aquatic Resources, lamprey: The Environmental Analysis should also estimate the amount and type of historic lamprey habitats in the project area to help define appropriate sideboards for potential mitigation measures.

10. Page 16, Aquatic Resources, sturgeon: The Environmental Analysis should similarly discuss historic sturgeon habitat and address potential measures to mitigate Project impacts to sturgeon.

We recommend that FERC not include a requirement within the scoping document that Douglas PUD prepare an analysis of pre-project habitat for lamprey, sturgeon or any other resources that were impacted during the construction of the Wells Project. It is clear that the existing baseline condition is the baseline against which the licensee is required to measure the environmental benefits and effects of the ongoing operation of the project, including any proposed alternative relicensing actions.



## **Douglas PUD Response to Stakeholder Comments on PAD**

### City of Brewster

On March 30, 2007, the City of Brewster (Brewster) submitted comments to FERC related to the PAD for the Wells Hydroelectric Project.

Douglas PUD has enjoyed a positive working relationship with Brewster since the start of the RWG process in 2005. We have also enjoyed a positive relationship with Brewster during the implementation of past Recreation Action Plans. We appreciated Brewster's active participation during the RWG process and look forward to working closely with the city throughout relicensing and the next license term.

We provide the following comments to FERC related to Brewster's recent comments to the PAD for the Wells Project.

#### Page 3, No. 8: The Recreation Use Assessment was inadequate

The City of Brewster states that the Recreation Use Assessment did not include well attended events, avoided peak usage times, Spanish-speaking recreationists were not approached, and that waterfowl hunting seasons were not adequately addressed.

Douglas PUD believes that these statements are not an accurate reflection of the professionally conducted and published Recreational Use Assessment conducted in 2005.

Regarding major events and peak usage, the Recreation Use Assessment was not a study of "events", but rather a survey of public use at Wells Project facilities. The goal of the study was to describe use levels, preferences, attitudes, and characteristics of the primary recreation user groups within the Wells Project. Significant effort was made to have surveyors present during times of peak use, including major holiday weekends. Surveys were conducted during Memorial Day weekend, Apple Pie Jamboree, Independence Day weekend, opening day of salmon fishing, and Labor Day. In addition, Douglas PUD conducted supplemental surveys in 2006 including Apple Pie Jamboree, hydroplane races, and whitewater rafting takeout locations in the lower Methow River. This supplemental data will be utilized in the Recreation Needs Analysis which, if approved by FERC, will be conducted as part of the ILP.

Regarding Brewster's comment that Spanish-speaking recreationists were not adequately represented in the survey, it should be noted that there were only seven people out of 360 who chose not to participate in the survey because they did not understand English. At least one person on each survey team spoke some Spanish, and was able to communicate enough to assist with completing the survey. In addition, the percentage of Hispanic respondents surveyed, compared to all other local respondents surveyed (Okanogan and Douglas Counties only), was 15.2 percent, which is slightly higher than the 2000 Census estimation for the two-county area (12.5%).

Regarding waterfowl hunting season, the survey strategy included fall surveys including the month of December. All access points were surveyed, including the Wells Wildlife Area, which is the most popular hunting area along Wells Reservoir.

#### City of Pateros

The City of Pateros (Pateros) submitted a letter to FERC on April 2, 2007 providing comments related to the PAD for the Wells Hydroelectric Project.

Douglas PUD has had a long and productive relationship with Pateros beginning in the early 1980's with the two-foot pool raise and continuing into the current Recreation Action Planning Process and RWGs that were started in 2005. We appreciate the active participation by Pateros during the RWG process. Their participation in the RWGs has lead to a well defined package of twelve proposed study plans that will be used to broaden our existing understanding of the effects of the Wells Project on natural and social resources.

We provide the following comments to FERC related to Pateros's recent comments to the PAD for the Wells Project.

#### Exhibit A, Comments under Section 5.6.4: Recreation Use Survey

##### **5.6.4 Current Recreational Use and Resource Capacity**

Pateros' Comment: The current Recreation Visitor Use Assessment has limitations and should not be used as the primary document for visitor use on the Wells Project. These kinds of surveys do not measure use this is not provided....

In addition, Pateros states that DTA's (2006) Recreation Visitor Use Survey should have included all activities in the project area, not just water activities. Douglas PUD would like to clarify that the Recreation Visitor Use Survey was specifically designed to study existing use within the Wells Project boundary. The notion that Douglas PUD should conduct a study that evaluates all potential recreational uses that could theoretically be provided is not only an impossible task, but it is beyond the scope of Douglas PUD's responsibilities for relicensing. The Recreation Visitor Use Assessment documented all types of activities taking place on Project lands and waters. These activities were both water and land based, including boating, fishing, picnicking, hiking, camping, bicycling, wildlife viewing, hunting, horseback riding, and relaxing.

Douglas PUD is proposing to utilize the Recreation Visitor Use Assessment as the primary documentation for visitor use within the Wells Project boundary. It is the most definitive, current and accurate assessment of visitor use and recreation demand for the Wells Project.

## USFWS

We provide the following comments to the USFWS letter related to their comments on the PAD.

On page 2 of the March 30, 2007 letter, the USFWS states:

“...we recommend that all appropriate study plans include at least a 2-year timeframe in which to collect baseline data.”

Douglas PUD would like to point out that each of the proposed study plans contains a detailed schedule for the completion of field activities, data analysis and report writing. The study schedules were developed by the RWGs and reflect careful consideration of the logistics of field sampling and the behavior and biology of the resource being studied. Some of the proposed study plans are proposed to cover a two-year timeframe while others have been proposed as one-year studies.

We recommend that any decision regarding the need to extend a proposed one-year study into a two-year study be made only after the results of that study have been provided in the Initial Study Report and rational for a second year have been discussed. Only then can an informed decision be made regarding the appropriateness of a second year of study.

On page 6 and 7 of the March 30, 2007 letter, the USFWS refers, in parts B, C and F, to:

“...sediment flushing operations at the Methow River confluence...”

Douglas PUD would like to offer some additional clarification on this issue. Daily operations of the Wells Project generally result in reservoir elevation fluctuations of one to two feet. During the past five years of operation, the daily fluctuation frequency of the reservoir was less than three feet 93.3% of the time and minimum elevations fell below 777 feet (four feet) only 3.8% of the time. Infrequent reservoir operations resulting in fluctuations over four feet in a 24 hour period have occurred only 1.1% of the time. In the last 15 years (1990-2005), the forebay maintained a minimum water surface elevation of at least 777 feet 95.1% of the time and infrequent reservoir operations occurred only 0.8% of the time.

When intense precipitation or rapid snowmelt increases inflow from the Methow River, the project is operated at a lower reservoir elevation to help reduce the potential build-up of delta-type deposits which might affect localized water levels and environmental resources. Under these conditions, Methow River flows will keep sediment moving from the lower Methow River.

The Terrestrial RWG addressed this issue in Section 6.4.3.3 of the PAD. The Terrestrial RWG concluded that the existing operating scenario has resulted in high quality macrophyte beds, which are vital to overwintering waterfowl, and also benefit bald eagles and waterfowl hunting. The Resource Work Group also noted that the wildlife conditions in the reservoir have evolved under the existing operating regime, including riparian and wetland habitat, and that reservoir fluctuations would only become an issue if the operating regime were to change in the future. Douglas PUD is not proposing to change reservoir operations under the new license.

If you have any questions related to Douglas PUD's comments contained within this letter, please feel free to contact me at (509) 884-7191.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Shane Bickford". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end.

Shane Bickford  
Supervisor of Relicensing

Cc: Relicensing Distribution List

## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

American Public Power Association  
Senior Gov't. Relations Representative  
Rebecca Blood  
2301 M Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1484

American Rivers, Inc.  
Rob Masonis, Senior Director  
4005 20th Ave. West, Suite 221  
Seattle, WA 98199

American Rivers, Inc.  
Brett Swift, Deputy Regional Director  
320 SW Stark Street, Suite 412  
Portland, OR 97204

American Whitewater  
National Stewardship Director  
Kevin Colburn  
1035 Van Buren Street  
Missoula, MT 59802

Avista Corporation  
Gary G. Ely, Chairman of the Board/CEO  
P.O. Box 3727  
Spokane, WA 99220-3727

Avista Corporation  
Gary Dahlke, Attorney  
717 West Sprague Avenue, Suite 1200  
Spokane, WA 99201-3505

Avista Corporation  
Ron Peterson, V.P., Energy Resources  
P.O. Box 3727  
Spokane, WA 99220-3727

Avista Corporation  
Colstrip Fuel & Wholesale Contracts  
Dave Spannagel  
P.O. Box 3727  
Spokane, WA 99220-3727

Bonneville Power Administration  
Integrated Fish & Wildlife Program  
Bill Maslen, Director  
P.O. Box 3621  
Portland, OR 97208-3621

Brewster City Council  
Bob Fateley, City Councilman  
P.O. Box 340  
Brewster, WA 98812

Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Stanley Speaks, Director  
911 NE 11th Avenue  
Portland, OR 97232

Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Hydropower Relicensing Coordinator  
Jennifer Frozena  
911 NE 11th Avenue  
Portland, OR 97232

## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Bob Dach  
911 NE 11th Avenue  
Portland, OR 97232

Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Sharon Yepa, Superintendent  
P.O. Box 389  
Wellpinit, WA 99040

Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Chuck James, Area Archaeologist  
911 NE 11th Avenue  
Portland, OR 97232

Bureau of Land Management  
Robert Towne, District Manager  
1103 N. Fancher Road  
Spokane, WA 99212-1200

Bureau of Land Management  
Sally Sovey, Field Manager  
915 N. Walla Walla Avenue  
Wenatchee, WA 98801-1521

Bureau of Land Management  
Richard Bailey, Archeologist  
1103 N. Fancher Road  
Spokane, WA 99212-1200

Bureau of Land Management  
Diane Priebe, Recreation Planner  
915 N. Walla Walla Avenue  
Wenatchee, WA 98801-1521

Bureau of Land Management  
James Rees  
915 N. Walla Walla Avenue  
Wenatchee, WA 98801-1521

Bureau of Land Management  
State Director  
P.O. Box 2965  
Portland, OR 97208-2965

Bureau of Reclamation  
Bill McDonald, Regional Director  
1150 N. Curtis Road, Suite 100  
Boise, ID 83706-1234

Bureau of Reclamation  
James B. Blanchard, Special Projects Officer  
P.O. Box 815  
Ephrata, WA 98823

CDR Associates  
Diane Tate, Program Manager  
100 Arapahoe Avenue, Suite 12  
Boulder, CO 80302

Chelan County Commissioners  
400 Douglas Street, Suite 201  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

Chelan County Public Utility District  
Rich Riazzi, General Manager  
P.O. Box 1231  
Wenatchee, WA 98807-1231

## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

Chelan County Public Utility District  
Gregg Carrington, Director of Licensing  
P.O. Box 1231  
Wenatchee, WA 98807-1231

Chelan County Public Utility District  
Carol Wardell, Counsel  
P.O. Box 1231  
Wenatchee, WA 98807-1231

Chelan County Public Utility District  
Michelle Smith, Licensing & Compliance  
P.O. Box 1231  
Wenatchee, WA 98807-1231

Chelan County Public Utility District  
Keith Truscott, Licensing & Environmental  
P.O. Box 1231  
Wenatchee, WA 98807-1231

City of Brewster  
Lee Webster, Mayor  
P.O. Box 340  
Brewster, WA 98812

City of Bridgeport  
Steven Jenkins, Mayor  
P.O. Box 640  
Bridgeport, WA 98813

City of Bridgeport  
Jean Hardie, Administrative Assistant  
P.O. Box 640  
Bridgeport, WA 98813

City of East Wenatchee  
Steve Lacey, Mayor  
271 Ninth Street NE  
East Wenatchee, WA 98802

City of Pateros  
Gail Howe, Mayor  
P.O. Box 8  
Pateros, WA 98846

City of Pateros  
George Brady, City Councilman  
P.O. Box 8  
Pateros, WA 98846

Columbia Basin Fish & Wildlife Authority  
Brian Lipscomb, Executive Director  
851 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 260  
Portland, OR 97204

Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission  
Rob Lothrop, Policy Manager  
729 NE Oregon, Suite 200  
Portland, OR 97232

Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission  
Robert Heinith, Hydro Program Coordinator  
729 NE Oregon, Suite 200  
Portland, OR 97232

Confederated Tribes and Bands of the  
Yakama Nation  
Manager of Cultural Resources Program  
Johnson Meninick  
P.O. Box 151  
Toppenish, WA 98948

## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

Confederated Tribes and Bands of the  
Yakama Nation  
Timothy R. Weaver, Attorney  
402 E. Yakima Ave., Suite 190  
Yakima, WA 98907

Confederated Tribes and Bands of the  
Yakama Nation  
Steve Parker, Fisheries Division  
P.O. Box 151  
Toppenish, WA 98948

Confederated Tribes and Bands of the  
Yakama Nation  
Paul Ward, Environmental Manager  
P.O. Box 151  
Toppenish, WA 98948

Confederated Tribes and Bands of the  
Yakama Nation  
Bob Rose, Asst. Environmental Manager  
P.O. Box 151  
Toppenish, WA 98948

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation  
Chairman, Tribal Business Council  
Mike Marchand  
P.O. Box 150  
Nespelem, WA 99155

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation  
Natural Resources Committee Chair  
Debbie Louie  
P.O. Box 150  
Nespelem, WA 99155

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation  
Doug Seymour, Cultural Committee Chair  
P.O. Box 150  
Nespelem, WA 99155

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation  
Joe Peone, Fish & Wildlife Director  
P.O. Box 150  
Nespelem, WA 99155

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation  
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer  
Camille Pleasants  
P.O. Box 150  
Nespelem, WA 99155

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation  
Steve Suagee, Reservation Attorney  
P.O. Box 150  
Nespelem, WA 99155

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation  
Sharon Redthunder, Real Property Officer  
P.O. Box 150  
Nespelem, WA 99155

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation  
Bill Towey  
910 N. Washington  
Spokane, WA 99201

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation  
Jerry Marco, Director  
P.O. Box 150  
Nespelem, WA 99155

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation  
Guy Moura, TCP Coordinator  
P.O. Box 150  
Nespelem, WA 99155



## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation  
Dinah Demers, Wildlife Biologist  
P.O. Box 150  
Nespelem, WA 99155

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation  
Mike Palmer, Parks & Recreation Manager  
P.O. Box 150  
Nespelem, WA 99155

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla  
Indian Reservation  
Carl Merkle, Salmon Policy Analyst  
P.O. Box 638  
Pendleton, OR 97801-0638

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP  
James Vasile, Attorney  
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20006

Dept. of Archeology & Historic Preservation  
State Historic Preservation Officer  
Allyson Brooks  
1063 South Capitol Way, Suite 106  
Olympia, WA 98501

Dept. of Archeology & Historic Preservation  
Rob Whitlam, State Archaeologist  
1063 South Capitol Way, Suite 106  
Olympia, WA 98501

Douglas Cty. Transportation & Land Services  
Mark Kulaas, Land Services Director  
140 19th Street  
East Wenatchee, WA 98802

Douglas County Commissioner  
Mary Hunt  
P.O. Box 747  
Waterville, WA 98858

Douglas County Commissioner  
Ken Stanton  
P.O. Box 747  
Waterville, WA 98858

Douglas County Commissioner  
Dane Keane  
P.O. Box 747  
Waterville, WA 98858

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Jim Hastreiter  
101 SW Main Street, Suite 905  
Portland, OR 97204

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Jon Miyashiro, Civil Engineer  
101 SW Main Street, Suite 905  
Portland, OR 97204

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Erich Gaedeke, FERC Compliance Officer  
101 SW Main Street, Suite 905  
Portland, OR 97204

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Regional Engineer  
101 SW Main Street, Suite 905  
Portland, OR 97204

## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

Grant County Public Utility District  
Tim Culbertson, Manager  
P.O. Box 878  
Ephrata, WA 98823

Grant County Public Utility District  
Ray Foianini, Attorney  
P.O. Box 908  
Ephrata, WA 98823-0908

Grant County Public Utility District  
William Madden, Attorney  
1700 K Street NW  
Washington, DC 20006-3817

Grant County Public Utility District  
Licensing & Compliance Manager  
Laurel Heacock  
P.O. Box 878  
Ephrata, WA 98823

Jeffers Danielson Sonn and Aylward PS  
Stanley Bastian, Attorney  
P.O. Box 1688  
Wenatchee, WA 98807

Jeffers Danielson Sonn and Aylward PS  
Garfield R. Jeffers, Attorney  
P.O. Box 1688  
Wenatchee, WA 98807

National Marine Fisheries Service  
Bob Lohn, Regional Administrator  
7600 Sand Point Way NE  
Seattle, WA 98115-0070

National Marine Fisheries Service  
Assistant Regional Administrator  
Bruce Suzumoto  
1201 NE Lloyd Blvd., Suite 1100  
Portland, OR 97232

National Marine Fisheries Service  
Keith Kirkendall, Branch Chief  
1201 NE Lloyd Blvd., Suite 1100  
Portland, OR 97232

National Marine Fisheries Service  
Hydro Program  
Bryan Nordlund, Hydraulic Engineer  
510 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 103  
Lacey, WA 98503

National Marine Fisheries Service  
Chris Fontecchio, CGNW  
7600 Sand Point Way NE  
Seattle, WA 98115

National Marine Fisheries Service  
Eastern Wash. Habitat Branch Chief  
Dale Bambrick  
304 S. Water St., Suite 201  
Ellensburg, WA 98926-3617

National Marine Fisheries Service  
Kristine Petersen, Fisheries Biologist  
1201 NE Lloyd Blvd., Suite 1100  
Portland, OR 97232

National Park Service  
Susan Rosebrough  
909 First Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98104

## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

Northwest Power & Conservation Council  
Council Member-Eastern Washington  
Tom Karier  
705 West First Avenue, MS-1  
Spokane, WA 99201

Northwest Power & Conservation Council  
Council Member-Western Washington  
Larry Cassidy  
110 Y Street  
Vancouver, WA 98661

Office of Interagency Committee  
Jim Eychaner, Outdoor Resource Planner  
P.O. Box 40917  
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

Office of Interagency Committee  
Laura Eckert Johnson, Director  
P.O. Box 40917  
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

Okanogan County Commissioner's Office  
Brenda Crowell, Clerk of the Board  
123 Fifth Avenue N., Room 150  
Okanogan, WA 98840

Okanogan County Commissioner  
Andy Lampe  
123 Fifth Avenue N., Room 150  
Okanogan, WA 98840

Okanogan Cty. Office of Planning & Devel.  
Nick Christoph, Natural Resource Planner  
123 Fifth Avenue N., Room 110  
Okanogan, WA 98840

Okanogan Cty. Office of Planning & Devel.  
Murray McCorry, Senior Planner  
123 Fifth Avenue N., Room 130  
Okanogan, WA 98840

Okanogan County PUD  
General Manager  
P.O. Box 912  
Okanogan, WA 98840-0912

Okanogan National Forest  
1240 Second Avenue South  
Okanogan, WA 98840

Okanogan Wilderness League  
Lee Bernheisel  
Star Route Box 244  
Carlton, WA 98814

Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife  
Virgil Moore, Director  
3406 Cherry Avenue NE  
Salem, OR 97303

PacifiCorp  
John P. Sample, Senior Counsel  
825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 1500  
Portland, OR 97232

PacifiCorp  
Commercial Trading, Contract Admin.  
Bill Miller, Manager  
825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 600  
Portland, OR 97232

## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

Port District of Douglas County  
Patrick Haley, Director  
3306A Fifth Street SE  
East Wenatchee, WA 98802

Port District of Douglas County  
Doug Provo, Business Manager  
3306A Fifth Street SE  
East Wenatchee, WA 98802

Portland General Electric  
Peggy Fowler, CEO/President  
121 SW Salmon Street  
Portland, OR 97204

Portland General Electric  
Bruce True, Analyst  
121 SW Salmon Street, 3WTCBR06  
Portland, OR 97204

Portland General Electric  
Loretta I. Mabinton, Asst. General Counsel  
121 SW Salmon Street, 1WTC1301  
Portland, OR 97204

Puget Sound Energy  
General Counsel  
Jennifer O'Connor, Senior V.P.  
P.O. Box 97034  
Bellevue, WA 98009-9734

Puget Sound Energy  
Project Development & Contract Mgmt.  
Paul Wiegand, V.P.  
P.O. Box 97034, PSE-12  
Bellevue, WA 98009-9734

Puget Sound Energy  
Regional and Public Affairs  
Phil Bussey, V.P.  
P.O. Box 97034  
Bellevue, WA 98009-9734

Puget Sound Energy  
Gov't. and Regulatory Relations  
Kimberly Harris, V.P.  
P.O. Box 97034  
Bellevue, WA 98009-9734

Puget Sound Energy  
Cary Feldman, Asset Manager  
P.O. Box 97034, OBC-14N  
Bellevue, WA 98009-9734

Representative Doc Hastings  
4th Congressional District  
1323 Longworth HOB  
Washington, DC 20515-4704

Representative Cathy McMorris  
5th Congressional District  
1708 Longworth HOB  
Washington, DC 20515

Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
Hydro Relicensing Mgmt. Analyst  
Carol Hackney-Szuch  
6301 S Street, Mail Stop A454  
Sacramento, CA 95817-1899

Seattle City Light  
Senior Engineer/Project Manager  
Kimberly Pate  
P.O. Box 34023  
Seattle, WA 98124-4023

## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

U.S. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation  
Don Klima, Director  
1100 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 809  
Washington, DC 20004

U.S. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation  
Laura Dean, Program Analyst  
1100 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 803  
Washington, DC 20004

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Debbie Knaub  
P.O. Box 2829  
Chelan, WA 98816

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
William McGinnis, Chief, Power Branch  
P.O. Box 2870  
Portland, OR 97208-2870

U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Patricia McAuley  
W. 316 Boone Avenue, Suite 568  
Spokane, WA 99201-2350

U.S. Department of Interior  
Nolan Shishido, Attorney  
500 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 607  
Portland, OR 97232-2036

U.S. Department of Interior  
William Bettenberg  
1849 C Street NW  
Washington, DC 20240

U.S. Department of Interior  
Regional Environmental Officer  
Preston Sleeper  
500 NE Multnomah St, Suite 356  
Portland, OR 97232-2036

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
John Bregar, Hydropower Coordinator  
1200 Sixth Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98101

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Rick Parkin, Unit Mgr. Geographic Implt.  
1200 Sixth Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98101

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Ren Lohofener, Regional Director  
911 NE 11th Avenue  
Portland, OR 97232

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Brian Cates, Project Leader, Leavenworth  
7501 Icicle Road  
Leavenworth, WA 98826-9319

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Stephen Lewis  
215 Melody Lane, Suite 119  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Mark Miller, Project Leader, Wenatchee  
215 Melody Lane, Suite 119  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Estyn Mead, Attorney  
911 NE 11th Avenue  
Portland, OR 97232-4128

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Gregg Kurz  
215 Melody Lane, Suite 119  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Susan Martin, Project Leader, Spokane  
11103 East Montgomery Drive  
Spokane, WA 99206

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Dan Trochta, Fish & Wildlife Biologist  
11103 East Montgomery Drive  
Spokane, WA 99206

U.S. Forest Service  
Steve Johnson, FERC Coordinator  
215 Melody Lane  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

U.S. Forest Service  
James Boynton, Forest Supervisor  
215 Melody Lane  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

U.S. Forest Service  
Ken McDonald, Fisheries Program Manager  
215 Melody Lane  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

U.S. Geological Survey  
Ray Smith, Field Office Chief  
W. 920 Riverside, Room 694  
Spokane, WA 99201

U.S. Senate  
Maria Cantwell, U.S. Senator  
717 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

U.S. Senate  
Patty Murray, U.S. Senator  
173 Russell Senate Bldg.  
Washington, DC 20510

Washington Governor's Office  
Christine Gregoire, Governor  
P.O. Box 40002  
Olympia, WA 98504-0002

Washington Native Plant Society  
Mike Marsh, Conservation Committee Chair  
3434 14th Avenue W.  
Seattle, WA 98119

Washington Native Plant Society  
Fred Weinmann, President  
6310 NE 74th St., Suite 215E  
Seattle, WA 98115

Washington Office of Attorney General  
Rob McKenna, Attorney General  
P.O. Box 40100  
Olympia, WA 98504-0100

## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

Washington Office of Attorney General  
Brian V. Faller, Asst. Attorney General  
P.O. Box 40117  
Olympia, WA 98504-0117

Washington Office of Attorney General  
William C. Frymire, Asst. Attorney General  
P.O. Box 40100  
Olympia, WA 98504-0100

Washington State Conservation Commission  
Richard Zones, District Manager/So. Douglas  
P.O. Box 246  
Waterville, WA 98858-0246

Washington State Department of Agriculture  
Linda Crerar, Policy Asst., Natural Resources  
P.O. Box 42560  
Olympia, WA 98504-2560

Wash. State Dept. of Community, Trade and  
Economic Development  
Juli Wilkerson, Director  
P.O. Box 42525  
Olympia, WA 98504-2525

Wash. State Dept. of Community, Trade and  
Economic Development  
Senior Energy Policy Specialist  
Howard Schwartz  
P. O. Box 43173  
Olympia, WA 98504-3173

Washington State Department of Ecology  
Jay Manning, Director  
P.O. Box 47600  
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

Washington State Department of Ecology  
Derek Sandison, Regional Director-Central  
15 W. Yakima Ave., Suite 200  
Yakima, WA 98902-3452

Washington State Department of Ecology  
Denise Mills, Section Manager  
15 W. Yakima Ave., Suite 200  
Yakima, WA 98902-3452

Washington State Department of Ecology  
Jonathan Merz, Water Quality Regional Mgr.  
15 W. Yakima Ave., Suite 200  
Yakima, WA 98902-3452

Washington State Department of Ecology  
Patricia S. Irle, Wenatchee Watershed Lead  
15 W. Yakima Ave., Suite 200  
Yakima, WA 98902-3452

Washington State Department of Ecology  
Chris Maynard  
P.O. Box 47600  
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Jeff Koenings, Director  
600 Capitol Way North  
Olympia, WA 98501-1091

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Curt Leigh, Hydropower Coordinator  
600 Capital Way North  
Olympia, WA 98501-1091

## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
William Tweit  
600 Capitol Way North - NRB  
Olympia, WA 98501-1091

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Dennis Beich, Regional Director  
1550 Alder Street NW  
Ephrata, WA 98823-7669

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Columbia River Policy Coordinator  
Carmen Andonaegui  
1550 Alder Street NW  
Ephrata, WA 98823-7669

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Joe Miller  
1550 Alder Street NW  
Ephrata, WA 98823-7669

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Tony Eldred, Fish & Wildlife Biologist  
608 S. Elliott Avenue  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Regional Wildlife Program Manager  
Matt Monda  
1550 Alder Street NW  
Ephrata, WA 98823-7669

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Beau Patterson, Wildlife Biologist  
3860 State Hwy. 97A  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Marc Hallet, Wells Wildlife Area Manager  
54 Moe Rd  
Brewster, WA 98812

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Chris Parsons, Project Manager, Region 2  
1550 Alder Street NW  
Ephrata, WA 98823

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Molly Hallock, Fish & Wildlife Biologist  
600 Capitol Way North  
Olympia, WA 98501-1091

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Bob Jateff, Region 2 Biologist  
P.O. Box 753  
Omak, WA 98841

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Brad James  
2108 Grand Blvd.  
Vancouver, WA 98661

Washington State Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Art Viola, Fish Biologist  
3860 State Hwy. 97A  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

Washington State Fish & Wildlife Comm.  
Eastern Washington Position - Chelan County  
Jerry Gutzwiler  
600 Capitol Way North  
Olympia, WA 98501-1091



## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

Washington State Dept. of Natural Resources  
Washington Natural Heritage Program  
Florence Caplow, Botanist  
P.O. Box 47001  
Olympia, WA 98504-7001

Washington State Dept. of Transportation  
Regional Planning Engineer  
David L Bierschbach  
P.O. Box 98  
Wenatchee, WA 98807

Washington State Dept. of Transportation  
Regional Projects Development Engineer  
Dan Sarles, Jr.  
P.O. Box 98  
Wenatchee, WA 98807

Washington State House of Representatives  
Mike Armstrong  
P.O. Box 40600  
Olympia, WA 98504-0600

Washington State House of Representatives  
Cary Condotta  
P.O. Box 40600  
Olympia, WA 98504-0600

Washington State Parks & Recreation Comm.  
Mike Nickerson  
Alta Lake State Park, 1 B, Otto Road  
Pateros, WA 98846

Washington State Parks & Recreation Comm.  
Bill Fraser, Parks Planner  
2201 N. Duncan Drive  
Wenatchee, WA 98801-1007

Washington State Parks & Recreation Comm.  
Jim Harris, Eastern Region Manager  
2201 N. Duncan Drive  
Wenatchee, WA 98801-1007

Washington State Parks & Recreation Comm.  
Mark D. Gillespie  
2201 N. Duncan Drive  
Wenatchee, WA 98801-1007

Washington State Parks & Recreation Comm.  
Eliot Scull, Commissioner  
3770 10th St. SE  
East Wenatchee, WA 98802

Washington State Rural Development Council  
Executive Director  
P.O. Box 11790  
Olympia, WA 98508-1790

Washington State Senate  
Linda Evans Parlette  
P.O. Box 40412  
Olympia, WA 98504-0412

Washington Utilities and Transportation Comm.  
Glenn Blackmon, Director  
P.O. Box 47250  
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Wenatchee National Forest  
FERC Coordinator  
215 Melody Lane  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

## RELICENSING DISTRIBUTION LIST

Wenatchee Valley Transportation Council  
Susan Driver, Transportation Planner  
300 South Columbia Street, 3rd Floor  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

Williams, John P.  
Researcher  
19815 NW Nestucca Drive  
Portland, OR 97229-2833